

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT INDIANA
HAMMOND DIVISION

MALIBU MEDIA, LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,) Civil Action Case No. _____
)
v.)
)
JOHN DOE subscriber assigned IP address)
76.29.3.214,)
)
Defendant.)

2 13CV 135

2013 SEP 22 AM 10:00

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
SERVE A THIRD PARTY SUBPOENA PRIOR TO A RULE 26(F) CONFERENCE**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Accord Brown v. Owens Corning Inv. Review Comm.</u> , 622 F.3d 564, 572 (6th Cir. 2010)	5
<u>Aimster Copyright Litig.</u> , 334 F.3d 643, 645 (7th Cir. 2003).....	6
<u>Arista Records LLC v. Does 1-19</u> , 551 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6-7 (D.D.C. 2008).....	4
<u>Arista Records, LLC v. Doe 3</u> , 604 F.3d 110 (2d Cir. 2010).....	4
<u>Blakeslee v. Clinton County</u> , 336 Fed.Appx. 248, 250 (3d Cir. 2009).....	5
<u>BMG Music v. Doe # 4</u> , No. 1:08-CV-135, 2009 WL 2244108, at *3 (M.D.N.C. July 24, 2009)..	
.....	4, 7, 8
<u>Columbia Ins. Co. v. Seescandy et al.</u> , 185 F.R.D. 573, 578-80 (N.D. Cal. 1999)	7
<u>Davis v. Kelly</u> , 160 F.3d 917, 921 (2d Cir. 1998)	5
<u>Dean v. Barber</u> , 951 F.2d 1210, 1215 (11th Cir. 1992)	5
<u>Elektra Entm't Group, Inc. v. Doe</u> , No. 5:08-CV-115-FL, 2008 WL 5111886, at *4 (E.D.N.C. Dec. 4, 2008).....	4, 6, 7
<u>Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co., Inc.</u> , 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991)	5
<u>Green v. Doe</u> , 260 Fed.Appx. 717, 719 (5th Cir. 2007)	5
<u>Guest v. Leis</u> , 255 F.3d 325, 336 (6th Cir. 2001)	8
<u>Interscope Records v. Does 1-14</u> , 558 F.Supp.2d 1176, 1178 (D. Kan. 2008).....	8
<u>Krueger v. Doe</u> , 162 F.3d 1173 (10th Cir. 1998).....	5
<u>Maclin v. Paulson</u> , 627 F.2d 83, 87 (7th Cir. 1980)	5
<u>Munz v. Parr</u> , 758 F.2d 1254, 1257 (8th Cir. 1985)	5
<u>Sony Music Entm't v. Does 1-40</u> , 326 F.Supp.2d 556, 564-65 (S.D.N.Y. 2004).....	4
<u>Penalbert-Rosa v. Fortuno-Burset</u> , 631 F.3d 592 (1st Cir. 2011).....	5
<u>Sony Music Entm't v. Does 1-40</u> , 326 F.Supp.2d 556, 566 (S.D.N.Y. 2004).....	7, 8
<u>Warner Bros. Records, Inc. v. Doe</u> , No. 5:08-CV-116-FL, 2008 WL 5111883, at *4 (E.D.N.C. Dec 4, 2008).....	4, 6, 7
<u>Young v. Transp. Deputy Sheriff I</u> , 340 Fed.Appx. 368 (9th Cir. 2009).....	5

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
SERVE A THIRD PARTY SUBPOENA PRIOR TO A RULE 26(f) CONFERENCE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1), Plaintiff hereby respectfully submits this Memorandum in support of its Motion for Leave to serve a third party subpoena prior to a rule 26(f) conference.

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff seeks leave to serve limited, immediate discovery on the John Doe Defendant's Internet Service Provider ("ISP") so that Plaintiff may learn Defendant's true identity. Plaintiff is suing Defendant for using the Internet, specifically the BitTorrent file distribution network to commit direct and contributory copyright infringement.

Since Defendant used the Internet to commit infringement, Plaintiff only knows Defendant by his Internet Protocol ("IP") address. Defendant's IP address was assigned to the Defendant by his respective ISP. Accordingly, the ISP can use the IP address to identify the Defendant. Indeed, ISPs maintain internal logs, which record the date, time and customer identity for each IP address assignment made by that ISP. Significantly, ISPs may maintain these logs for only a short period of time.

Plaintiff seeks leave of Court to serve a Rule 45 subpoena on the ISP and any related intermediary ISPs. Any such subpoena will demand the true name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address of the Defendant. Plaintiff will only use this information to prosecute the claims made in its Complaint. Without this information, Plaintiff cannot serve the Defendant nor pursue this lawsuit to protect its valuable copyrights.

II. ARGUMENT

Pursuant to Rule 26(d)(1), except for circumstances not applicable here, absent a court order, a party may not propound discovery in advance of a Rule 26(f) conference. Rule 26(b)

provides courts with the authority to issue such an order: “[f]or good cause, the court may order discovery of any matter relevant to the subject matter involved in the action.” In Internet infringement cases, courts routinely find good cause exists to issue a Rule 45 subpoena to discover a Doe defendant’s identity, prior to a Rule 26(f) conference, where: (1) plaintiff makes a prima facie showing of a claim of copyright infringement, (2) plaintiff submits a specific discovery request, (3) there is an absence of alternative means to obtain the subpoenaed information, (4) there is a central need for the subpoenaed information, and (5) defendants have a minimal expectation of privacy. See Arista Records, LLC v. Doe 3, 604 F.3d 110 (2d Cir. 2010) (citing Sony Music Entm’t v. Does 1-40, 326 F.Supp.2d 556, 564-65 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (numbers added)); Elektra Entm’t Group, Inc. v. Doe, No. 5:08-CV-115-FL, 2008 WL 5111886, at *4 (E.D.N.C. Dec. 4, 2008) (same); Warner Bros. Records, Inc. v. Doe, No. 5:08-CV-116-FL, 2008 WL 5111883, at *4 (E.D.N.C. Dec 4, 2008) (same); BMG Music v. Doe # 4, No. 1:08-CV-135, 2009 WL 2244108, at *3 (M.D.N.C. July 24, 2009) (same). See also, Arista Records LLC v. Does 1-19, 551 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6-7 (D.D.C. 2008), and the cases cited therein, noting the “overwhelming” number of cases where copyright infringement plaintiffs sought to identify “Doe” defendants and courts “routinely applied” the good cause standard to permit discovery. Here, Plaintiff easily satisfies all of these requirements. Accordingly, this Court should grant the Motion.

A. Circuit Courts Unanimously Permit Discovery to Identify John Doe Defendants

Federal Circuit Courts have unanimously approved the procedure of suing John Doe defendants and then using discovery to identify such defendants.

For example, the Second Circuit stated in Davis v. Kelly, 160 F.3d 917, 921 (2d Cir. 1998) that “courts have rejected the dismissal of suits against unnamed defendants . . . identified

only as ‘John Doe’s . . . until the plaintiff has had some opportunity for discovery to learn the identities.’ See also, Penalbert-Rosa v. Fortuno-Burset, 631 F.3d 592 (1st Cir. 2011) (“A plaintiff who is unaware of the identity of the person who wronged her can . . . proceed against a ‘John Doe’ . . . when discovery is likely to reveal the identity of the correct defendant.”). Accord Brown v. Owens Corning Inv. Review Comm., 622 F.3d 564, 572 (6th Cir. 2010); Blakeslee v. Clinton County, 336 Fed.Appx. 248, 250 (3d Cir. 2009); Young v. Transp. Deputy Sheriff I, 340 Fed.Appx. 368 (9th Cir. 2009); Green v. Doe, 260 Fed.Appx. 717, 719 (5th Cir. 2007); Krueger v. Doe, 162 F.3d 1173 (10th Cir. 1998); Dean v. Barber, 951 F.2d 1210, 1215 (11th Cir. 1992); Munz v. Parr, 758 F.2d 1254, 1257 (8th Cir. 1985); Maclin v. Paulson, 627 F.2d 83, 87 (7th Cir. 1980).

B. Good Cause Exists to Grant the Motion

1. Plaintiff Has a Prima Facie Claim for Copyright Infringement

A prima facie claim of copyright infringement consists of two elements: (1) ownership of a valid copyright, and (2) copying of constituent elements of the work that are original. Feist Publ’ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co., Inc., 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991). Plaintiff satisfied the first good cause factor by properly pleading a cause of action for copyright infringement:

29. Plaintiff is the owner of the Copyrights-in-Suit, as outlined in Exhibit B, each of which covers an original work of authorship.
30. By using BitTorrent, Defendant copied and distributed the constituent elements of each of the original works covered by the Copyrights-in-Suit.
31. Plaintiff did not authorize, permit or consent to Defendant’s distribution of its works.

Complaint at ¶¶ 29-31. See 17 U.S.C. §106; In re Aimster Copyright Litig., 334 F.3d 643, 645 (7th Cir. 2003), *cert. denied*, 124 S. Ct. 1069 (2004) (“Teenagers and young adults who have access to the Internet like to swap computer files containing popular music. If the music is

copyrighted, such swapping, which involves making and transmitting a digital copy of the music, infringes copyright.”); Elektra Entm’t Group, Inc. v. Doe, No. 5:08-CV-115-FL, 2008 WL 5111886, at *4 (E.D.N.C. Dec. 4, 2008) (“[P]laintiffs have established a prima facie claim for copyright infringement, as they have sufficiently alleged both ownership of a valid copyright and encroachment upon at least one of the exclusive rights afforded by the copyright.”); Warner Bros. Records, Inc. v. Doe, No. 5:08-CV-116-FL, 2008 WL 5111883, at *4 (E.D.N.C. Dec 4, 2008) (same). Further, Plaintiff’s allegations of infringement are attested to by Plaintiff’s investigator, IPP, Limited’s employee, Tobias Fieser. See Declaration of Tobias Fieser in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion For Leave to Serve Third Party Subpoenas Prior to a Rule 26(f) Conference (“Fieser Declaration”) at ¶¶ 18 - 22, Exhibit A. Accordingly, Plaintiff has exceeded its obligation to plead a prima facie case.

2. Plaintiff Has Clearly Identified Specific Information It Seeks Through Discovery

Plaintiff seeks to discover from the Defendant’s ISP the true name, address, telephone number and e-mail address of the Defendant. This is all specific information that is in the possession of the Defendant’s ISP that will enable Plaintiff to serve process on Defendant. Since the requested discovery is limited and specific, Plaintiff has satisfied the second good cause factor. Sony Music Entm’t v. Does 1-40, 326 F.Supp.2d 556, 566 (S.D.N.Y. 2004); BMG Music v. Doe # 4, No. 1:08-CV-135, 2009 WL 2244108, at *3 (M.D.N.C. July 24, 2009) (finding under nearly identical circumstances that “the discovery request is sufficiently specific to establish a reasonable likelihood that the identity of Doe # 4 can be ascertained so that he or she can be properly served”).

3. No Alternative Means Exist to Obtain Defendant's True Identities

Other than receiving the information from the Defendant's ISP, there is no way to obtain Defendant's true identity because "[t]he ISP is the only party who possesses records which track IP address assignment to their subscribers. Consequently, the ISP is the source for information relating to associating an IP address to a real person." Fieser Declaration at ¶ 8. Indeed, "[o]nce provided with the IP Address, plus the date and time of the detected and documented infringing activity, ISPs can use their subscriber logs to identify the name, address, email address and phone number of the applicable subscriber in control of that IP address at the stipulated date and time." Fieser Declaration at ¶ 22. Since there is no other way for Plaintiff to obtain Defendant's identity, except by serving a subpoena on Defendant's ISPs demanding it, Plaintiff has established the third good cause factor. See Columbia Ins. Co. v. Seescandy et al., 185 F.R.D. 573, 578-80 (N.D. Cal. 1999); Elektra Entm't Group, Inc. v. Doe, No. 5:08-CV-115-FL, 2008 WL 5111886, at *4 (E.D.N.C. Dec. 4, 2008) (finding that the feasibility of a suggested alternative method of determining defendants' identities by hiring a private investigator to observe downloading "is questionable at best"); Warner Bros. Records, Inc. v. Doe, No. 5:08-CV-116-FL, 2008 WL 5111883, at *4 (E.D.N.C. Dec 4, 2008) (same).

4. Plaintiff Needs the Subpoenaed Information to Advance the Asserted Claims

Obviously, without learning the Defendant's true identity, Plaintiff will not be able to serve the Defendant with process and proceed with this case. Plaintiff's important statutorily protected property rights are at issue in this suit and, therefore, the equities should weigh heavily in favor of preserving Plaintiff's rights. Since identifying the Defendant by name is necessary for Plaintiff to advance the asserted claims, Plaintiff has established the fourth good cause factor. Sony, 326 F.Supp. at 566; BMG Music v. Doe # 4, No. 1:08-CV-135, 2009 WL 2244108, at *3

(M.D.N.C. July 24, 2009) (finding under nearly identical circumstances that “[p]laintiffs have shown that the subpoenaed information—Doe # 4’s identity—is centrally needed to advance Plaintiffs’ copyright infringement claim”).

5. Plaintiff’s Interest in Knowing Defendant’s True Identities Outweighs Defendant’s Interests in Remaining Anonymous

Plaintiff has a strong legitimate interest in protecting its copyrights. Defendant is a copyright infringer with no legitimate expectation of privacy in the subscriber information he provided to his ISP, much less in distributing the copyrighted work in question without permission. See Guest v. Leis, 255 F.3d 325, 336 (6th Cir. 2001) (“computer users do not have a legitimate expectation of privacy in their subscriber information because they have conveyed it to another person—the system operator”); BMG Music v. Doe # 4, No. 1:08-CV-135, 2009 WL 2244108, at *3 (M.D.N.C. July 24, 2009) (finding under nearly identical circumstances that “[p]laintiffs have shown that Defendant Doe # 4 has a minimal expectation of privacy in downloading and distributing copyrighted songs without permission”); Interscope Records v. Does 1-14, 558 F.Supp.2d 1176, 1178 (D. Kan. 2008) (a person using the Internet to distribute or download copyrighted music without authorization is not entitled to have their identity protected from disclosure under the First Amendment); Sony, 326 F.Supp.2d at 566 (“defendants have little expectation of privacy in downloading and distributing copyrighted songs without permission”). Since Defendant does not have a legitimate interest in remaining anonymous, and since Plaintiff has a strong, statutorily recognized and protected interest in protecting its copyrights, Plaintiff has established the fifth good cause factor.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should grant leave to Plaintiff to issue a Rule 45 subpoena to the ISP.

Dated: April 18, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

NICOLETTI & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

By: /s/ Paul J. Nicoletti

Paul J. Nicoletti, Esq. (P44419)

36880 Woodward Ave, Suite 100

Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304

Tel: (248) 203-7800

Fax: (248) 203-7801

E-Fax: (248) 928-7051

Email: paul@nicoletti-associates.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT INDIANA
HAMMOND DIVISION

MALIBU MEDIA, LLC,

2 13CV135

Plaintiff,

Civil Action Case No. _____

v.

JOHN DOE subscriber assigned IP address
76.29.3.214,

Defendant.

**DECLARATION OF TOBIAS FIESER IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO TAKE DISCOVERY PRIOR TO A RULE 26(f) CONFERENCE**

I, TOBIAS FIESER, HEREBY DECLARE:

1. My name is Tobias Fieser.
2. I am over the age of 18 and am otherwise competent to make this declaration.
3. This declaration is based on my personal knowledge and, if called upon to do so, I will testify that the facts stated herein are true and accurate.
4. I am employed by IPP, Limited ("IPP"), a company organized and existing under the laws of Germany, in its litigation support department.
5. Among other things, IPP is in the business of providing forensic investigation services to copyright owners.
6. As part of my duties for IPP, I routinely monitor the BitTorrent file distribution network for the presence of copyrighted works, and I identify the Internet Protocol ("IP") addresses that are being used by infringers to distribute these copyrighted works.
7. An IP address is a numerical identifier that is assigned to a subscriber by the subscriber's Internet Service Provider ("ISP").

8. ISPs keep track of the IP addresses assigned to their subscribers. The ISP is the only party who possesses records which track IP address assignment to their subscribers. Consequently, the ISP is the source for information relating to associating an IP address to a real person.

9. IP addresses may be assigned by the ISP to different subscribers at different times. However, at no point in time can more than one subscriber be assigned the same IP address. ISPs maintain records of which subscriber is assigned an IP address at a given point in time. Accordingly, in order to correlate a person with an IP address, the ISP needs to be given an applicable date and time reference point.

10. ISPs only retain IP address assignment information for a limited amount of time.

11. Plaintiff retained IPP to monitor the BitTorrent file distribution network in order to identify IP addresses that are being used by to distribute Plaintiff's copyrighted works without authorization.

12. IPP tasked me with effectuating, analyzing, reviewing and attesting to the results of this investigation.

13. During the performance of my duties, I used forensic software named INTERNATIONAL IPTRACKER v1.2.1 and related technology enabling the scanning of the BitTorrent file distribution network for the presence of infringing transactions involving Plaintiff's movies. A summary of how the software works is attached as Exhibit A.

14. INTERNATIONAL IPTRACKER v1.2.1 was correctly installed and initiated on a server located in the United States of America.

15. I personally extracted the resulting data emanating from the investigation.

16. After reviewing the evidence logs, I isolated the transactions and the IP addresses being used on the BitTorrent file distribution network to distribute Plaintiff's copyrighted works.

17. Computer(s) using the IP address identified on Exhibit B connected to IPP's investigative server in order to transmit a full copy, or a portion thereof, of each digital media file as identified by its hash values set forth on Exhibit B. At no point did IPP distribute any of Plaintiff's copyrighted works. Our software is designed in such a way to prevent any distribution of copyrighted content.

18. The IP address, hash values and hit dates contained on Exhibit B correctly reflect what is contained in the evidence logs.

19. Our software analyzed each bit downloaded from the IP address identified on Exhibit B. Our software further verified that each of these bits was a portion of the file hash as listed on Exhibit B. Each file hash listed on Exhibit B was verified to be a digital media file containing a motion picture as enumerated in Exhibit B. Our software downloaded one or more bits of each file hash listed on Exhibit B from the IP address referenced on Exhibit B.

20. I was provided with a control copy of each copyrighted work identified on Exhibit B (the "Movie"). I viewed each Movie side-by-side with the corresponding digital media file identified by its file hash value as set forth on Exhibit B. I verified that each digital media file contained a motion picture that was identical, strikingly similar or substantially similar to the Movie associated with it, as identified by its file hash, on Exhibit B.

21. I used our software and related technology to document a wider scope of activity by Defendant within the BitTorrent file distribution network. The results of this additional surveillance are set forth on Exhibit C which contains each applicable transaction date and file name distributed by Defendant.

22. Once provided with the IP Address, plus the date and time of the detected and documented infringing activity, ISPs can use their subscriber logs to identify the name, address, email address and phone number of the applicable subscriber in control of that IP address at the stipulated date and time.

FURTHER DECLARANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

DECLARATION

PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I hereby declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this 12th day of April, 2013.

TOBIAS FIESER

By: Tobias Fieser

EXHIBIT A

**TO: DECLARATION OF TOBIAS FIESER IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO TAKE DISCOVERY PRIOR TO A RULE 26(f)
CONFERENCE**

IPP international LTD.

FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION

IPP international IPTRACKER v1.2.1

Table of contents

1	Introduction	3
2	The program IPP international IPTRACKER v1.2.1	4
2.1	Description of Action.....	4
2.1.1	Filesearch	4
2.1.2	Summarlization of the procedure	4
2.1.3	Safety of IP and other connection data.....	4
2.1.4	The date and time.....	4
2.2	Visualisation of the process	5
2.3	Description of the most important program functions	6
3	Logdata database.....	7
3.1	Protection of data privacy and data security	7
4	Addendum.....	8
	Gnutella	9
	Gnutella 2	9
	eDonkey2000 (Ed2k).....	10
	Bittorrent (BT).....	11
	Globally Unique Identifier (GUID).....	12
	The hash value	12

1 Introduction

The following disquisition introduces the software IPP international IPTRACKER. The software was developed to determine copyright violations in peer-to-peer networks (called P2P networks) and to preserve evidences during illegal distribution of copyright protected material.

P2P allows spreading data of every kind (software, music, video etc.) via the Internet fast. The data is saved on the computers of the participants and is distributed by common P2P software products which are available on the Internet for free. The Data is usually copied from foreign computers (called download) while other data is sent at the same time (called upload). Every participant can release files on his computer and make it available to others, comparable to the file release function within a local network. The files are copied via direct connection between the computers. P2P networks have millions of users and offer an enormous variety of files.

The procedure itself is legal for data which is not under copyright.

A common description of the operation of most commonly used P2P peer-to-peer techniques used to exchange data on the Internet can be found in the addendum.

2 The program IPP international IPTRACKER v1.2.1

2.1 Description of Action

2.1.1 Filesearch

Once a file is downloaded, verified and definitely allocated to a Rights holder, the hash value is used to determine possible sources on the internet. Different servers, trackers and clients provide lists of IPs where the specific file could or still can be downloaded.

2.1.2 Summarization of the procedure

These lists are downloaded from the providing system and computed sequentially. Each IP found in these lists is requested using the common P2P protocol functions. If the requested P2P client confirms the existence of the file on the local hard disc (in the shared folders), the download is started.

If the part downloaded is sufficient to be verified and compared to the original, the IP address and exact time and date is stored in a secure database.

The download process is continued.

After completion of the download process and before the stored information is used for further steps the downloaded data is compared with the original (complete already downloaded and verified file) bit by bit.

2.1.3 Safety of IP and other connection data

A direct and continuous connection between the IPTRACKER-server and the uploader of the file is established and exists at least 10 seconds before, during and at least 10 seconds after the capture sequence i.e. during the whole download process.

Optionally the screen can be capture automatically to backup another evidence.


2.1.4 The date and time

The (IPTRACKER-) server date and time is synchronised every minute via Network time protocol (NTP). This function is provided by an additional program (Dimension 4 v5.0 <http://www.thinkman.com/dimension4>).

The synchronization report is saved frequently and redundantly stored on a file server. The time is received from the Federal technological Institute in Brunswick (Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt in Braunschweig) and has a maximum deviation of for 1/10 second (atomic clock).

Several other redundant institutes providing the exact time are stored in an internal database of the program: Dimension 4.

2.2 Visualisation of the process



2.3 Description of the most important program functions

The IPP international IPTRACKER is based on the hybrid Filesharing client Shareaza 2.4.0.0. All communication interfaces correspond to the specifications of the P2P protocols BitTorrent, Gnutella 1 and 2 as well as ED2k. These interfaces were left invariably in the filesharing client.

The function of the upload in addition was reduced to a minimum (handshaking). The IPP International IPTRACKER merely stores the data of the hosts connected with, if the package verification succeeds.

- IP address
- port
- exact capture time
- name of the protocol
- filename
- file size
- hash values of the file (SHA1, ED2k, BITH)
- GUID
- username
- clientname
- content downloaded

A screenshot of the host can be made by the IPTRACKER program. The host is marked automatically during the download phase to safeguard another evidence. Not relevant entries are masked. The name of the screenshot is also stored in the database.

To guarantee the immutability of the data, IP, date and time is signed with a private 4096 bit RSA key. The RSA key is included internally in the IPTRACKER program using a precompiled library and can be not read or used elsewhere.

RSA is a recognized asymmetrical encoding procedure which can be used both for the encoding and for the digital signature. It uses a key pair consisting of a private key which is used decode or sign data and a public key with which decoding or signature checks are made possible. Both keys are kept secret.

3 Logdata database

The data is stored in a MySQL database. The database server runs locally as a service on the respective server. The connection is established via ODBC driver: MyODBC-3.51.11. The query language is SQL. The IPTRACKER program accesses the database exclusively writing. The entries right-related cannot be changed.

The data is exclusively submitted as data sheets for the assertion of the injured rights.

3.1 Protection of data privacy and data security

The rack-servers are stored in a room which is locked and protected with most current security mechanisms.

The database is password protected and stored on an encoded hard disk. The hard disk is encoded with TrueCrypt 6.0 using AES encryption. The password is not saved on any computer, only known by two people and has more than 25 signs. It must be entered manually at every system startup. When the hard disk is removed from the computer or the power supply, it has to be mounted again using the password.

If the hard disk should be reached by unauthorized people, the data security is therefore ensured at any time.

To maximize data security, the IPTRACKER program offers an implemented program function which permits not only to sign but also to encode completely relevant data. So the data cannot be seen or changed even by persons with direct access to the server.

To create valid entries the secret key pair is necessary. It is not possible to store data manually at any time.

Only the IPTRACKER program is able to create valid data.

The data can only be decoded and used by the responsible lawyer, only his software contains the deciphering method and this one in this case also secret (called "public") key.

4 Addendum

Basic Knowledge

P2P networks can be subdivided into several groups using their structure and operation.

Centralized P2P systems

These systems are using a central server to which all knots are connected. All search enquiries from the knots are processed by the server. The basis of P2P systems is the data transmission between the individual knots. A direct connection between the knots is established when the file is found on a specific knot.

The server is the bottle of the neck in this process.

Nowadays centralized P2P systems are of more minor importance.

Pure P2P systems without a central instance

There are networks without a central server which do not manage any central data stock (Gnutella1 and Gnutella2 network).

P2P-Filesharing networks via server client protocol

There are networks with one or several central servers which manage information about the users connected at present. This is provided by the BitTorrent and eDonkey network. With the installation of Emule the users receive a list of all users (file: server.met) attached to a server and all released files. BitTorrent and eDonkey cover currently 95% of the exchange activity.

Gnutella


Gnutella is a P2P network decentralized completely which can be observed by the IPP international IPTRACKER software. "Decentralized" means that every knot uses a similar software and there are no central servers which process search enquiries.

A search query is passed to the neighbouring systems at first. These systems refer the query to their neighbours until the requested file was found. After that a direct connection for the data transmission can be established between searching and offering knot

Gnutella 2

Gnutella 2 works most largely like the original Gnutella network with a similar connection system but Unicode2 search function with extensive metadata, TigerTree Hashing, and generally faster link speed. A "Partial file Sharing" function was implemented which divides files into parts. It's possible to download these parts from different knots instead of downloading the whole file from one knot.

Some known Gnutella2 clients are:
Shareaza, Morpheus, Gnuclous, adaglo, MLDonkey




Page 10

March 8, 2011

eDonkey2000 (Ed2k)

The eDonkey2000 peer to peer network needs server to connect the knots. The server only provides lists of files which are available on the individual knots.

Some Edonkey2000 clients are: eMule, eMulePlus, aMule, xMule, MLDonkey, Lphant



BitTorrent (BT)

BitTorrent is used for the fast distribution of large amounts of data in which central servers are controlling the location of the files.


BitTorrent does not behave like a usual P2P network. There is no search function like it is available at EDonkey or Gnutella clients.

To get all necessary information for a download, a .torrent file is downloaded (from another network or an internet page). It contains all information to start the download.

The BitTorrent participants connect with the so-called tracker of this file and with that with other users who also are interested in at this file. A private network is built.

Trackerless systems were developed in new versions. The tracker function is done by the client software. This avoids some of the previous problems (e.g. the missing failure safety of the trackers).

Some BitTorrent clients are: Shareaza, BitComet, Azureus



Globally Unique Identifier (GUID)

Every P2P user receives a unique identification which consists of a 32-digit hexadecimal number. The user receives the identification at the moment of the installation of the P2P program. The program generates the GUID from user-specific data. So it is possible that a user has several GUID identifications (e.g. he gets a new GUID at the installation of a network client), however, it is not possible that an allocated GUID is allocated to another user again.

The hash value

The hash value is necessary to identify a file.

A special advantage of BitTorrent, eDonkey and Gnutella networks is the fault-free data transmission between the users. Bigger files are subdivided into little packages. For every package a single identification value is generated using known algorithms. The hash value is frequently described as a fingerprint since it is unique similarly like a fingerprint.

i.e. each file exceeding the size of 2 megabytes owes more than one hash value – one for the whole file and one for each package.

Standard operation of common P2P-client programs during the filesharing process:

The client software must guarantee that the received content is always the queried one. Therefore only hash values are requested – filenames are unimportant during the transmission.

After a client received a data package the content has to be verified. Therefore the hash value of the package is generated by the client and compared to the hash value provided before. If the two keys are identical, the downloaded package is accepted. If there are deviations at the comparison, then the package is declined and requested again. The package can also be downloaded from another knot.

All mentioned programs are able to split bigger files into packages and to identify these using hash values independently which program is used for the data exchange. With this it is possible to assign small parts of a file to the original file. It is made sure that the part of the file always belongs to the requested file.

After the whole file is downloaded it will be verified on the whole before the download process is finished and the file is signed as "VERIFIED".

Every network uses different hash algorithms. BitTorrent the so-called "BTH", eDonkey this one "ED2K", and Gnutella the "SHA1" algorithm.

The IPP international IPTRACKER is able to generate and compare each hash algorithm listed above.

File Hashes for IP Address 76.29.3.214**ISP:** Comcast Cable**Physical Location:** Hobart, IN

Hit Date UTC	File Hash	Title
03/18/2013 03:57:21	06E1049B1052CA5A2F30CF70D13C124D8060F913	Still With Me
03/18/2013 03:01:37	D8B57414779137FA51F91E847F28C659ED331B7D	My Best Friends Boyfriend
03/18/2013 02:15:07	7F026F98870E8811AE9CDE0FA1D9D2B2682E9FCD	Afternoon Snack
03/17/2013 15:46:20	1CB96688F394A65E450BB191FF2B7353B240A7D3	Show You My Love
03/17/2013 01:07:54	D782C04236BB7EC2FE88BA877115E0FDE9C022D6	Jumping on the Bed
03/17/2013 00:54:36	B5A57CD035598D39FD3552354C196C2CD9EB1E35	Red Satin
03/16/2013 19:27:46	493C4697829128333D1095B6259C046CA0A99859	Another Night
03/16/2013 19:14:38	488A0F27CB97745A6772353E34FA19E702DADE29	Afternoon Picnic
03/16/2013 03:37:31	6A95B76DE0780E8FF2DC3C5DAFA52640C195CFE3	Apartment in Madrid
03/16/2013 02:28:12	F8C806DF92D3B1CDD3003B1D9CC43826876F373B	Ready for Bed
03/16/2013 01:42:51	1AC23122A8B10AFE4F7CEF1B6746428096E0B9E4	Tuesday Morning
03/14/2013 22:23:55	58965D289717A18D7BDB25C515562F66C07603A9	Paradise Found
03/14/2013 20:37:39	98DE457F485C12DBD49609127F6CB2CBBE0E082F	Deep Longing
03/02/2013 01:53:40	BC2FB2F0B4C21041E44FF3ED68364E5365D0856D	Wild Things
02/24/2013 01:33:06	6BA1E888B0A277770FECB22BCAB0AB56F8CD8742	Working Out Together

Total Statutory Claims Against Defendant: 15